

EPA Official Record

Notes ID: A99C5455994369108525786900546437

From: Dave Dickerson/R1/USEPA/US

To: "Rigassio-Smith, Anita" <Anita.Rigassio-Smith@jacobs.com>

Delivered Date: 04/10/2009 04:19 PM EDT

Subject: RE: Alternative #4 \$80M/year

thanks Anita - let me look this over and get back to you on Monday. Have a great Easter weekend.

Dave

▼ "Rigassio-Smith, Anita" <Anita.Rigassio-Smith@jacobs.com>

"Rigassio-Smith, Anita" <Anita.Rigassio-Smith@jacobs.com> 04/10/2009 04:08 PM		
	To	Dave Dickerson/R1/USEPA/US@EPA
	cc	"Fox, Steve \ (New Bedford\)" <Steve.Fox@jacobs.com>, "Gouveia, Mark" <Mark.Gouveia@jacobs.com>
	Subject	RE: Alternative #4 \$80M/year

Hello Dave,

The attached spreadsheet demonstrates what my e-mail was trying to convey. And as shown, I am loading each year with more activity than we can realistically perform. The rates in the spreadsheet assume 24-hour, year-round operation. Ice in the Upper Harbor would likely curb the year-round UHCC development and filling activities. Similarly, residences alongside the Lower Harbor would likely curb the 24-hour LHCC development and filling activities.

One other consideration, unrelated to the rates, is the sizes of the two CAD cells. With a full year of hydraulic dredging in 2009, we have ~570K cy of TSCA material (not including wetlands) to dispose of in the CAD cells. Up until this point we assumed the LHCC would be 300,000 cy and the UHCC would be 421,777 cy [total = 721,777 cy]. Should we reduce the UHCC capacity by ~150K cy?

Please let us know when it will be convenient for you to discuss the spreadsheet and these concerns.

Thank you,
Anita

-----Original Message-----

From: dickerson.dave@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:dickerson.dave@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, April 08, 2009 8:16 PM
To: Rigassio-Smith, Anita
Cc: Gouveia, Mark; Fox, Steve (New Bedford); Catri.Cynthia@epamail.epa.gov; Peterson.David@epamail.epa.gov; Ng.ManChak@epamail.epa.gov; Gutro.Doug@epamail.epa.gov; Brill.Larry@epamail.epa.gov; Falvey.Jeanethe@epamail.epa.gov; stanley.elainet@epamail.epa.gov
Subject: Re: Alternative #4 \$80M/year

Anita - sounds like we should discuss some more, but can you elaborate a bit more on why the \$50m level works well?

Just for clarification, you're saying that even after year 2 in your scenario below, it would be difficult to spend \$80m/yr?

Thanks for checking in - Dave

"Rigassio-Smith,
Anita"
<Anita.Rigassio-Smith@jacobson.com> To: Dave Dickerson/R1/USEPA/US@EPA
> cc
"Fox, Steve \ (New Bedford\)"
04/08/2009 04:49 <Steve.Fox@jacobson.com>, "Gouveia,
PM Mark" <Mark.Gouveia@jacobson.com>
Subject
Alternative #4 \$80M/year

Hi Dave,

The Alt #4 Hybrid @ \$80M/yr is in internal review, and I working on Alt #4 @ \$80M/year.

Because of the costs, production rates, and sequencing of the tasks, I am having difficulty spending \$80M/year. The limiting factor is number

of days per year that we can work, even if we have simultaneous activities and double shifts.

For example (in rough numbers), in Year 2, when we stop hydraulic dredging, if we work 24-hour shifts and double-up activities, we can perform the LTM (\$0.5M), demobilize Areas C&D (\$9.2M), purchase the marine equipment (\$4.4M), empty Cell #1 and cap the DDA (\$17M), build the LHCC (\$9.0M), remove ~200,000 cy from the UHCC (\$9.8M) and maintain fixed costs (\$17M) for \$68M.

If we want to remove more material from the UHCC we must increase the amount of marine equipment we purchase.

Another option would be to continue hydraulic dredging with T&D for years 2 and 3.

Alternatively, we could adjust the estimate to \$50M/year. From my iterations, this seems like the optimum funding level for the 2 CAD cell approach.

Do you have a preference or another idea?

Anita

NOTICE - This communication may contain confidential and privileged information that is for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any viewing, copying or distribution of, or reliance on this message by unintended recipients is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer.

NOTICE - This communication may contain confidential and privileged information that is for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any viewing, copying or distribution of, or reliance on this message by unintended recipients is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer.

[attachment "Set Up Activities Rev3.xls" deleted by Dave Dickerson/R1/USEPA/US]